

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 25, 2006

AMENDED IN SENATE JANUARY 11, 2006

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 22, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 16, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 14, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 25, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 4, 2005

## SENATE BILL

**No. 767**

---

**Introduced by Senator Romero  
(Coauthor: Senator Torlakson)**

February 22, 2005

---

An act relating to school district governance.

### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 767, as amended, Romero. School district governance: ~~mayoral governance.~~ *study and report.*

Existing law ~~authorizes the voters of a charter city, or city and county to provide for the election or appointment of members of the governing board of a school district the boundaries of which are within the territory of the city or city and county~~ *provides for the establishment, governance, organization, and reorganization of school districts.*

This bill would require the California Research Bureau of the State Library to *study and examine specified school districts during a certain timeframe and to submit a report* ~~regarding, among other things, mayoral governance of a school district~~ to the Legislature on or

before October 1, 2007, ~~and makes legislative findings and declarations relating to the Los Angeles Unified School District regarding the bureau's review of specified areas for each of those school districts, including, among others, the structure of school district governance in each district.~~

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1     SECTION 1. (a) *The California Research Bureau of the State*  
2     *Library shall study and examine the school districts specified in*  
3     *subdivision (b) during a 10-year timeframe starting in 1995 and*  
4     *ending in 2005, unless otherwise indicated, and shall submit a*  
5     *report to the Legislature on or before October 1, 2007, that*  
6     *includes all of the following:*

7     (1) *Review of the structure of school district governance in*  
8     *each district and provide a history of any change in school*  
9     *district governance over the past 10 years, including conditions*  
10    *that lead to these changes. This structural examination shall*  
11    *include the authority and accountability of, as appropriate, the*  
12    *district superintendent, elected school board, mayor, mayor*  
13    *appointed school board, and schools.*

14    (2) *Review of growth in pupil achievement. For each district,*  
15    *the study shall do the following:*

16    (A) *Provide pupil demographic information, including*  
17    *enrollment, race and ethnicity, English language learners, pupils*  
18    *eligible for free and reduced price lunch meals, and transience*  
19    *rates over time.*

20    (B) *Analyze pupil achievement data in each district, including*  
21    *regular and charter schools, using each respective state's*  
22    *standardized achievement tests and high school graduation rates.*  
23    *In this respect, the study shall do the following:*

24    (i) *Identify and compare the components of the state*  
25    *accountability systems in the states where the districts are*  
26    *located, including comparison of academic standards and the*  
27    *measurement of achievement.*

28    (ii) *Analyze district changes in achievement over time (10*  
29    *years when available) post adoption of a state accountability*  
30    *system.*

1     (iii) *Identify the changes in academic achievement over time of*  
2 *subgroups of pupils disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and*  
3 *English language learners.*

4     (iv) *Identify the achievement gaps between subgroups of pupils*  
5 *in the districts over time.*

6     (C) *Compare strategies and programs utilized in each district*  
7 *in their efforts to improve pupil achievement. In this respect, the*  
8 *study shall do the following:*

9     (i) *Identify significant school improvement initiatives that*  
10 *directly resulted in increased pupil achievement, such as school*  
11 *counselors, college preparatory courses, and career technical*  
12 *courses.*

13     (ii) *Identify who directed the effort.*

14     (iii) *Identify how long it took for achievement gains to occur.*

15     (iv) *Identify the cost per pupil for these initiatives.*

16     (3) *Review the funding structure of each district, including the*  
17 *following:*

18     (A) *The authority, responsibility, and ability of the respective*  
19 *states, counties, cities, and mayors to provide funding for school*  
20 *districts.*

21     (B) *The funding mechanism, revenue sources, and per pupil*  
22 *expenditures.*

23     (C) *Specific funding mechanisms in mayoral control districts*  
24 *that could be used to increase financial support for nonmayoral*  
25 *control districts.*

26     (D) *Specify any ongoing private contributions to all schools,*  
27 *including charter schools, in each district.*

28     (4) *Identification of specific changes in certificated and*  
29 *classified collective bargaining agreements related to school*  
30 *improvement during the 10-year timeframe or before and after*  
31 *any changes in school district governance.*

32     (5) *Review of classroom and school infrastructure of each*  
33 *district, to include all of the following:*

34     (A) *The physical condition of schools and the costs of*  
35 *improvements made during the timeframe, including the extent of*  
36 *overcrowding, and the number, if any, of portable classrooms*  
37 *onsite.*

38     (B) *Pending school facilities projects and timeframe for*  
39 *completion.*

1 (C) *The history and investment in infrastructure and facilities*  
2 *improvements in each district.*

3 (D) *The number of school instructional days and the structure*  
4 *of the school calendar, such as traditional schedule or multitrack*  
5 *schedule.*

6 (b) *The school districts to be studied and examined for*  
7 *purposes of the report specified in subdivision (a) shall be all of*  
8 *the following, which includes the state of location:*

9 (1) *Baltimore City Public School System, Maryland.*

10 (2) *Boston Public Schools, Massachusetts.*

11 (3) *Broward County Public Schools, Florida.*

12 (4) *Chicago Public Schools, Illinois.*

13 (5) *Cleveland Municipal School District, Ohio.*

14 (6) *Detroit Public Schools, Michigan.*

15 (7) *Garden Grove Unified School District, California.*

16 (8) *Houston Independent School District, Texas.*

17 (9) *Long Beach Unified School District, California.*

18 (10) *Los Angeles Unified School District, California.*

19 (11) *New York City Schools, New York.*

20 (12) *Seattle Public Schools, Washington.*

21 ~~SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the~~  
22 ~~following:~~

23 ~~(a) The schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District~~  
24 ~~(LAUSD) are facing severe academic, financial, and~~  
25 ~~infrastructure challenges.~~

26 ~~(b) Pupils in the LAUSD are vastly underachieving. The base~~  
27 ~~score of the LAUSD on the state's Academic Performance Index~~  
28 ~~(API) remains well below the state average and almost 50~~  
29 ~~percent of schools of the LAUSD are ranked in deciles 1 to 3,~~  
30 ~~inclusive, on the API.~~

31 ~~(c) A recent Harvard University report found that graduation~~  
32 ~~rates for pupils of the LAUSD are much lower than previously~~  
33 ~~acknowledged. Currently, the LAUSD is graduating less than 50~~  
34 ~~percent of its pupils.~~

35 ~~(d) Classrooms and school infrastructure in the LAUSD are in~~  
36 ~~an unacceptable physical condition.~~

37 ~~(e) Under the current governance structure, the LAUSD Board~~  
38 ~~of Education and its superintendent lack authority to coordinate~~  
39 ~~resources with local government agencies.~~

1     ~~(f) Several major cities across the nation, including Boston,~~  
2     ~~New York, Chicago, and Cleveland, have implemented direct~~  
3     ~~mayoral leadership in schools, resulting in both improved~~  
4     ~~academic achievement and additional resources for educational~~  
5     ~~programs.~~

6     ~~SEC. 2. (a) On or before October 1, 2007, the California~~  
7     ~~Research Bureau of the State Library shall submit a report to the~~  
8     ~~Legislature that includes all of the following:~~

9     ~~(1) Review of case studies in other states that have considered~~  
10    ~~the subject of mayoral governance of a school district in an urban~~  
11    ~~setting.~~

12    ~~(2) Causal relationship between mayoral governance of an~~  
13    ~~urban school district and pupil outcomes, including increases in~~  
14    ~~pupil scores on the California High School Exit Examination and~~  
15    ~~Academic Performance Index, and decreases in pupil dropout~~  
16    ~~rates.~~

17    ~~(3) Efficiency or management gains when an urban school~~  
18    ~~district is subject to mayoral governance, including gains in~~  
19    ~~financial resources.~~

20    ~~(4) Ability of a mayor to coordinate resources between local~~  
21    ~~government agencies when an urban school district is subject to~~  
22    ~~mayoral governance.~~

23    ~~(5) Ability of parents and pupils to participate in and resolve~~  
24    ~~pupil problems or issues when an urban school district is subject~~  
25    ~~to mayoral governance.~~

26    ~~(6) Ability to create strong leadership and accountability when~~  
27    ~~an urban school district is subject to mayoral governance.~~

28    ~~(7) The challenges and issues faced by a mayor when an urban~~  
29    ~~school district that is subject to mayoral governance has~~  
30    ~~boundaries that extend beyond the city's boundaries.~~

31    ~~(b) The California Research Bureau report submitted to the~~  
32    ~~Legislature pursuant to subdivision (a) shall also discuss the~~  
33    ~~extent to which, if any, the report findings, including the findings~~  
34    ~~of paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive, of subdivision (a), apply to~~  
35    ~~and are faced by the Los Angeles Unified School District.~~